

The House Education and Labor Committee must hold immediate hearings with the Secretary so that we can ask him under oath if he solicited this memo.

The Federal Government should never treat parents like terrorists for showing up at public hearings to oppose the racist critical race theory or the perverted sex-ed curriculum that is being forced upon our children.

Parents are in charge of the school system, not liberal activists from Washington, D.C., who are using the FBI as their political police force.

#### GUARD AND RESERVE GI BILL PARITY ACT OF 2021

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 860, I call up the bill (H.R. 1836) to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the time during which members of the Armed Forces serve on active duty for training qualifies for educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 860, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-25 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1836

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021".*

#### SEC. 2. POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD DUTY.

(a) *OTHER QUALIFYING DUTY.—Section 3311(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—*

*(1) by striking "(including)" each place it appears and inserting "(including other qualifying duty and";*

*(2) by striking "(excluding)" each place it appears and inserting "(including other qualifying duty but excluding"; and*

*(3) in paragraph (2), by inserting "or other qualifying duty" after "active duty" both places it appears.*

*(b) OTHER QUALIFYING DUTY DEFINED.—Section 3301 of such title is amended—*

*(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and*

*(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:*

*"(3) The term 'other qualifying duty' means the following:*

*"(A) During the period beginning on August 1, 2025, and ending on July 31, 2032, active duty for training performed by a member of the Armed Forces—*

*"(i) on or after August 1, 2025; or*

*"(ii) before August 1, 2025, if such individual is a member of the Armed Forces on or after such date.*

*"(B) On or after August 1, 2032, duty performed before, on, or after such date that is—*

*"(i) active duty for training performed by a member of the Armed Forces; or*

*"(ii) inactive duty training performed by a member of the Armed Forces.".*

*(c) TIME LIMITATION FOR USE OF ENTITLEMENT FOR OTHER QUALIFYING DUTY.—Section 3321 of such title is amended—*

*(1) in subsection (a)—*

*(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "; or" and inserting a semicolon;*

*(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; or"; and*

*(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:*

*"(3) in the case of an individual whose entitlement is based on other qualifying duty performed—*

*"(A) before August 1, 2025, expires on the later of—*

*"(i) the end of the 15-year period beginning on the date of the discharge or release of such individual from the Armed Forces; or*

*"(ii) August 1, 2040; or*

*"(B) on or after August 1, 2025, shall not expire."; and*

*(2) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:*

*"(6) INDIVIDUALS SUBJECT TO TWO PERIODS.—In the case of an individual subject to periods under paragraphs (1) and (3)(A) of subsection (a), the period under such paragraph (3)(A) shall apply to such individual's entitlement.".*

#### SEC. 3. MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN HOUSING LOAN FEES.

*(a) EXTENSION.—The loan fee table in section 3729(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking "January 14, 2031" each place it appears and inserting "October 1, 2031".*

*(b) IRRRL RATE.—The item in subparagraph (E) of the loan fee table under such section is amended to read as follows:*

<i>"(E)(i) Interest rate reduction refinancing loan (closed on or after July 1, 2022, and before October 1, 2030) .....</i>			
<i>0.85</i>	<i>0.85</i>	<i>NA</i>	
<i>(ii) Interest rate reduction refinancing loan (closed during a period not covered by clause (i))</i>			
<i>0.50</i>	<i>0.50</i>	<i>NA"</i>	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1836, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1836, as amended, Representative LEVIN's Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021.

This bill is a long-needed fix to the unequal treatment of members of the Guard and Reserve for GI Bill purposes. Under current law, guard and reserv-

ists do not accrue education benefits the same as their Active-Duty counterparts, even when they are carrying out the same duties and taking on the same risks.

We live in a new age of national defense where we utilize the total force concept with an operational reserve, not a Strategic Reserve. We rely each day on guard and reservists to protect and defend our country. As we observed the anniversary of the January 6 attack on the Capitol, we were reminded of the brave Guard and Reserve troops who deployed to protect Congress, our staffs, and the foundation of our democracy.

We continue to rely on our Reserve components throughout the COVID-19 pandemic to activate and support public health response efforts across the country. The National Guard has been utilized at unprecedented levels in recent years.

Over the past 2 years, our Reserve components have fought wildfires, responded to protests, assisted with the withdrawal from Afghanistan, and even helped Afghan refugees settle in the United States.

It is time the Guard and Reserve benefits reflect the key work they are doing and the need for equity across the total force. It is time for every day in uniform to count.

The cadence of activations for guard and reservists has increased significantly over the last 5 years, and with that comes the need to meet mission readiness standards.

To prepare for the critical role they fulfill in our national defense, guard and reservists must frequently train, which means more days in uniform, more days away from their civilian life, and more days away from their families.

□ 1245

The GI Bill is both a recruitment and transition benefit to help servicemembers transition into civilian life and close the opportunity gap with their civilian peers.

Now, the Guard and Reserves need this more than ever as they are constantly transitioning between military, civilian employment, and family life, facing continuous disruptions.

This legislation rectifies the disparity and ensures that members of our Reserve forces know that every day they commit to our Nation counts, and that they will have the education benefits waiting for them when they fulfill their commitment.

In both this and the 116th Congress, we reformed and updated the Post-9/11 GI Bill to ensure students who are eligible have easy access to a high-quality education.

We have implemented strong student protections and we are holding bad acting institutions accountable when they fail to meet standards we set for veteran education.

Now, if servicemembers can step up and do their part day in and day out

while holding down civilian jobs and squeezing in time to take care of their families, then the least we can do here in Congress is to get out of the way of the solution.

Now, there are troubling reports of upticks in suicide among our guard and reservists.

One of the best ways we can address veteran health, mental health, and ultimate veteran suicide is by providing veterans with support and a pathway to a successful civilian life.

H.R. 1836, as amended, will give guard and reservists access to the opportunities that post-secondary education and training provide and improve their reintegration into civilian life.

This legislation is fully paid for and uses loan fee provisions that this Congress and prior Congresses have supported. In addition, even the Republican substitute uses the same offsets.

Besides just being the right thing to do, investing in equitable GI Bill benefits for guard and reservists will provide more than a tenfold return to our country.

Who are we to stand in the way of an educational benefit that will not only make our country stronger, but will benefit our military by having military servicemembers and our guard and reservists who are even more able to do their jobs on behalf of our national defense? I can't wait to see what our servicemembers will do with this opportunity, and I know it will make our country a better country.

This legislation is endorsed by numerous VSOs, including the American Legion, the VFW, the Student Veterans of America, the National Guard Association of the United States, Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States, and Reserve Officers of America.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD letters of support and statements from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the National Guard Association of the United States, Military-Veterans Advocacy, and the Reserve Officers of America.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,  
Washington, DC.

Tomorrow we are expecting the House to take votes on H.R. 1836, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act. The American Legion supports this bill as our signature education priority for 2022, and we strongly urge Representative Valadao to stand for DC's National Guard troops and support its passage.

All 50 states have activated components of their National Guard in response to unforeseen challenges over the past two years. From protecting borders to delivering pandemic aid and supporting local law enforcement our National Guard and Reserve troops have responded to new challenges like never before. Often, they are leaving both their families and civilian employers for an extended amount of time sometimes taking a sizeable pay cut with them. Yet despite all we ask of them, too often they are denied a cornerstone benefit for our nation's veterans: the GI Bill.

This is because servicemembers are activated under non-DNE title 32 orders which VA statutes currently don't recognize as

valid "active duty" time. H.R. 1836 would fix this disparity by expanding access to the Post-9/11 GI Bill for servicemembers activated under Title 32 orders towards benefits eligibility.

The American Legion urges support for H.R. 1836.

Thank you and happy to answer any questions.

JOHN KAMIN,  
Legislative Associate, Legislative Division.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS  
DO THE RIGHT THING FOR GUARD AND RESERVE  
MEMBERS

Now is the time for Congress to pass legislation to allow National Guard and Reserve members to rightfully earn GI Bill benefits for their time served. National Guard and Reserve members serve alongside active duty service members and consistently make sacrifices without always earning VA education benefits. Congress must act to expand eligibility to allow the increasingly frequent activations of these service members to count toward Post-9/11 GI Bill eligibility.

The VFW strongly supports H.R. 1836, Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021, to ensure equity of benefits for Reserve component service members. This bill would allow any day in uniform receiving military pay to count toward Post-9/11 GI Bill eligibility, allowing activated National Guard and Reserve members to earn this education benefit and achieve upward mobility. For years, the sacrifices of these service members have been overlooked in achieving GI Bill eligibility. These inequities have been further highlighted through the COVID-19 pandemic as National Guard and Reserve members stood on the front lines administering relief and health services. The time is now for parity with all the armed forces in earning their VA education benefits.

Contact your representatives today and tell them to support the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021. Congress must pass this crucially needed legislation now. National Guard and Reserve members have been waiting long enough!

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC.

Good Morning, I am writing to express the National Guard Association's strong support for H.R. 1836—the bipartisan Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act, that will be considered this week on the House floor. This bill caps a years-long effort to recognize the service and sacrifice of our National Guard. In addition to acknowledging the service of our Guard Soldiers and Airmen, this bill will prove a hugely significant recruiting and retention tool as we continually deploy Guard units to contingencies both at home and abroad.

While we understand the concerns relating to costs in the out years, we ask that you vote NO on the Substitute amendment (H.R. 2047). While this amendment would reduce long term costs, it significantly reduces the reach and impact of the legislative change and eliminates the central goal of parity in benefit as it relates to training H.R. 1836 is trying to accomplish.

The bipartisan H.R. 1836 will prove to be the most significant Post-9/11 G.I. Bill change specifically for the Reserve Component since the creation of the program itself and we are excited for the prospect of this bill passing the House of Representatives. Additionally, we look forward to continued bipartisan discussions with your Senate colleagues as we work towards final language on this critical issue to your National Guard servicemembers.

Thanks for your consideration, please feel free to reach out for any additional information.

Best,

JULIAN CARDINALE,  
Joint Legislative Affairs Manager.

MILITARY-VETERANS ADVOCACY, INC.,  
Slidell, Louisiana, January 10, 2022.  
Hon. MIKE LEVIN,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LEVIN, On behalf of Military-Veterans Advocacy® (MVA™), we would like to pledge our support for HR 1836.

This bill will ensure that the time during which members of the Armed Forces serve on active duty for training qualifies for educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Specifically, the bill adjusts the type of service that entitles a member of the Armed Forces, reserves, or National Guard to such assistance. Under the bill, service by a reservist or National Guard member that is entitled to pay counts toward benefit eligibility. Such service includes training, active military service, inactive training, and general duty for which basic pay is warranted.

You may use this letter as evidence of our support for this bill. Feel free to use it in Committee or in press releases.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. WELLS,  
Chairman of the Board.

ROA  
RESERVE STRENGTH RESERVE LIFE  
ACTION CENTER—VOTE FOR HR 1836, GI BILL  
PARITY ACT

Floor vote today on H.R. 1836! This bill expands eligibility for Post-9/11 GI Bill educational assistance to include all paid points days for National Guard and Reserve service members. This means that service members can earn GI Bill eligibility days for training, active military service, inactive training, and general duty for which basic pay is warranted. Active duty earns benefits when training, and this bill would allow the Guard and Reserve to earn the same benefit.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Speaker NANCY PELOSI and Leader STENY HOYER for considering this legislation today, and I urge the rest of my colleagues to support this legislation to ensure every day a guard or reservist spends in uniform counts toward earning vital GI Bill benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1836, as amended, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021.

While I support the intent of this bill, I do not believe that it is the right solution for our Nation's guard and reservists at this time.

Founded in 1636, the National Guard evolved from groups of colonial militias into one of the toughest and one of the most professional fighting forces in the world.

From defeating the British during the American Revolution, to fighting in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Reserve component has served in every major conflict in the history of this Nation.

In recent years, the Guard and Reserve have been called up more often as their missions have changed.

These brave men and women are not only on the front lines overseas, but they are also deployed at home to protect the southern border and assist in the response to COVID-19, among others.

We must never forget the sacrifices the men and women in the Guard and Reserve make when the Federal Government calls on them to serve.

I agree that Congress must take a hard look at duty status reform and the potential expansion of benefits for guard and reservists. But this bill before us today would be an unwise expansion of benefits.

The higher level of sacrifice of Active-Duty servicemembers is reflected in the higher level of benefits provided by the VA. This is why the government recognizes the increased sacrifices of the Reserve component when they are called up on most Federal Active-Duty orders.

I believe that one of the biggest misunderstandings in this debate is that many of the types of Federal Active-Duty service that members of the National Guard and Reserve perform already qualify for the GI Bill eligibility.

I support the goal of ensuring that all time spent on nontraining Active Duty Federal orders should count towards GI Bill eligibility.

However, the bill before us today would go far beyond that and provide eligibility for the GI Bill for service related to annual training and drilling weekends.

Training has never counted towards eligibility, and members of the Guard and Reserve know that when they sign up. Let me say that again. Training has never counted towards eligibility with members of the Guard and Reserves. They knew it when they signed up. It is the additional call-ups to Federal Active-Duty service that members of the Guard and Reserve may not know about.

This type of service would be covered by Congressman MOORE's amendment, which I believe is a better alternative.

Also, covering training is the largest cost driver of this bill, which leads to my second point.

The CBO projects that the expansion of benefits laid out in this bill would require nearly \$2 billion in mandatory offsets for the first 10 years following enactment. While these costs are paid for in the current budget window, that does not tell the whole story.

CBO also estimates that this bill will cost taxpayers more than \$5 billion in each of the next four decades after fiscal year 2032. This would equate to at least 20 billion extra dollars over the next 50 years.

None of these extra costs are offset, which means our children and grandchildren will be paying for them and be paying them off for many years to come.

In a tight fiscal environment, I believe that full Active-Duty benefits for

training and drilling is a bridge too far. I am also concerned that the offsets that are used in this bill should be saved for higher priority issues like expanding services to toxic-exposed veterans.

Addressing the needs of toxic-exposed veterans is both my and Chairman TAKANO's number one priority that we are trying to deal with right now. That could require Congress to find hundreds of billions of dollars in offsets. Offsets are few and far between in the Veterans' Affairs Committee. We will need every penny of them to enact these needed reforms that we were talking about earlier.

Earlier this week before the Rules Committee, Chairman TAKANO indicated that \$2 billion is an insignificant amount compared to the potential full cost of addressing toxic exposure, and therefore, is not worthy to try to save here. I disagree.

It is silly that I even have to say this, but \$2 billion is a lot of money. It is worth saving. Ask any taxpayer. And remember, the people we are talking about are taxpayers, as well.

Like me, my constituents and many Americans are concerned that Congress doles out billions of taxpayer dollars like candy. That must end. We can provide needed benefits for veterans without burdening future generations. But that requires Congress to make tough decisions and to put first things first.

Many of my concerns could have been discussed, debated, and possibly even addressed if the majority had conducted the proper level of engagement with committee members, VA, and other stakeholders on this bill.

The majority did not hold a single legislative hearing on this bill this Congress. As such, we were not able to receive views from the committee members, the administration, the mortgage industry, or veteran service organizations. Those views are a critical part of the legislative process.

Why was this bill not put on the agenda for one of the two legislative hearings the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held this Congress?

This is no way to responsibly legislate, and I implore Chairman TAKANO to go back to our committee's bipartisan tradition of conducting full legislative due diligence before sending bills to the House floor.

In closing, I am supportive of reviewing and, where warranted, expanding benefits for members of the Guard and Reserve. However, we must do so in a way that is fiscally responsible, appropriate, and respects the many differences between Guard and Reserve service and Active-Duty service.

The bill before us today does not meet that standard.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I yield to my distinguished colleague, I am going to make a few re-

marks in reference to what the ranking member said.

I will first say that the bill has been in the public for more than 2 years. In fact, the committee held a Guard-and-Reserve-only benefits hearing just over a year ago to review the disparity in these benefits, and we have worked closely with the stakeholders, as evidenced by the numerous numbers of VSOs whose support letters I entered into the RECORD earlier. And we also worked with the minority to ensure that this bill achieves the aims that we intend.

We have also worked closely with the Department of Defense and VA to ensure all Guard and Reserve members are covered.

The VSOs have been asking for this reform, and that is why we stand with them in support of H.R. 1836.

Now, moreover, it is not accurate to say that before the Rules Committee yesterday I characterized the \$2 billion cost of this bill, which is paid for, as insignificant. I merely compared it to the idea that we should use this bill as part of an offset for the \$300 billion or so that we are going to need for toxic exposure. And I thank the ranking member for joining together in trying to find a solution for our toxic-exposed veterans.

However, that \$300 billion, I know we are going to figure out how to take care of that. It is really not a choice; it is a moral obligation we have to those veterans that were exposed to burn pits. It is not a choice. It is a cost of war, and we have got to rise together as a body. We found \$30 billion willy-nilly to add to the National Defense Authorization Act. We will find the \$300 billion. We don't need to be nickel and diming our reservists and our Guard units and deny them the days that should count toward their GI Bill benefits because they are doing every bit the same sort of readiness training that our Active-Duty servicemembers are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN), my good friend and chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity who is also the author of this very impressive bill.

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman TAKANO for yielding and for his support and partnership on this legislation and all the work that he does leading our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act, bipartisan legislation I introduced to deliver some basic fairness in the way we provide GI Bill benefits for the men and women who serve our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the GI Bill has allowed millions of veterans to pursue higher education and find rewarding career paths.

□ 1300

Servicemembers consistently cite GI Bill benefits as one of the top reasons

they choose to serve in our Armed Forces because of the opportunities those benefits provide for them and their families. However, the way that we allow servicemembers to accrue GI benefits is inherently unfair. While Active-Duty servicemembers receive credit for GI Bill benefits every day that they are in the service, Guard and Reserve members only accrue those benefits in very limited circumstances.

That disparity continues to exist despite the fact that Guard and Reserve members are increasingly taking on the same risks and doing the same jobs as their Active-Duty counterparts. We have seen this trend for decades but it has become especially pronounced over the last 2 years.

In response to the attack on our Capitol on January 6 of last year, 25,000 National Guard members mobilized from 54 States and territories to protect this institution. For a time, they slept on the cold, hard floors of this building. National Guard members have also deployed across our country to support the COVID-19 response, including Guard members who deployed from Ohio, Maryland, Delaware, and Georgia to assist healthcare operations this month.

In 2020, 1,300 soldiers and airmen from five different States were mobilized to fight wildfires in my State of California and throughout the West Coast. Not only are these National Guard and Reserve members risking their lives to serve our country, but they are also forced to put their civilian lives on hold when they are called up, leaving behind their families and interrupting civilian careers. Similarly, they are forced to put their lives on hold every time they are called up for training. In some of those settings they are serving side by side with Active Duty members doing similar jobs and facing similar risks, but they are not earning the same GI Bill benefits as their peers. That is unacceptable and it is shameful that we have asked Guard and Reserve members to step up in response to natural disasters, the pandemic, and an attack on our democracy without providing them with this fundamental benefit.

Clearly, it is long past time that we provide some basic fairness in the way that we allow Guard and Reserve members to accrue these benefits. The legislation that we are considering today will do exactly that, with a simple fix to ensure that every day they spend in uniform counts towards their GI Bill benefits.

Now, I know my friends on the other side of the aisle might raise concerns about the costs of expanding eligibility for these benefits, and I would note that this bill includes provisions my Republican colleagues have supported in the past to help defray the cost of veterans' benefits. And to my colleagues who still are not willing to pay for these benefits, I would ask them to share their concerns directly with Guard and Reserve members the next

time they are deployed in response to a natural disaster or other emergency in the community that they represent.

So I think we all want the same thing. My friends across the aisle, us on this side of the aisle, we all want the same thing. We all want to provide benefits to those who have served our country. I believe that in good faith. I do think that we have to not pay lip service, though. We have to make sure that we support servicemembers and not just when it is politically convenient. We don't need half measures. We don't need things that shortchange our servicemembers. So I think it is time for us to step up. It is time to give them the benefits they have earned for protecting the American people in a way now that they are doing unlike before. And that is what this bill aims to do.

As the chairman mentioned, it has support from a wide range of veteran service organizations, including the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Student Veterans of America, the National Guard Association of the United States, the Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States, and Reserve Officers Association. They are asking us to pass this bill, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act, today because they agree that it is past time to provide some basic fairness in the way that we provide GI Bill benefits to Guard and Reserve members.

Mr. Speaker, passing this bipartisan bill is the right thing to do for all the men and women who serve and protect our Nation, and I urge my colleagues to vote "aye."

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, just quickly before I yield time to my colleague from Ohio, I would like to remind the Members that training for members of National Guard and Reserve has never been counted towards GI Bill eligibility. Members of Guard and Reserve know that, as I said in my opening, when they sign up.

Now, the Democrat majority did not hold a legislative hearing on this bill, so to that extent, the expansion of eligibility was needed to increase recruitment and retention within the Guard and Reserve component and DOD, but DOD did not have the opportunity to testify to that before the committee because we didn't meet.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), who has actually served both in the Reserve and Active component of our military.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 1836, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act.

As a member of the Army Reserve, I know the critical role that reservists and members of the National Guard play in defending our great Nation. Unfortunately, I also know firsthand that sometimes unique skills and experiences the guardsmen and reservists bring to the table have been discounted or underutilized. That has always bothered me, as I personally know of the

expertise that exists in our Guard and Reserve and their capabilities.

Great strides have been made to value the Reserve and Guard like we value Active Duty, and we have come a long way and we need to continue that work. At the same time, I also know that Active Duty requires a level of commitment that does differ from the Guard and Reserve. Unfortunately, this bill has significant problems that prevent me from supporting it, which could have been worked out in the committee process had there been a full legislative hearing on it. And that is why I say I stand to discuss this bill because this is the first opportunity I have really had to discuss it.

H.R. 1836 would provide guard and reservists with Active-Duty service credit towards GI Bill eligibility for every day they are in uniform, on Federal orders, including training. So this is a status that has never been counted towards educational benefits.

Now, as cochair of the Congressional Bipartisan Burn Pits Caucus, the committee's highest priority this Congress has been working to address the health effects that toxic exposures in the military, including from burn pits. I am very concerned that the substantial spending in this bill could pull away from those efforts to address toxic exposure in this tight fiscal environment.

I also have concerns that this legislation might continue a slow creep of a permanent Federalizing of the National Guard, which was never the intent. We must be mindful not to usurp State authority of the Guard. What I do believe would be appropriate, however, would be to allow guardsmen and reservists to accrue GI Bill eligibility for any time spent on Federal Active-Duty service other than training, as many in this body that serve here in Congress have done as Guard and Reserve.

I was called to Active Duty for 15 months; 12 months in Iraq. That should count. And that is a discussion we should have had, and what actually should maybe count and what should not because I think there is common ground. But we haven't had a chance to discuss it. There is just the bill. Representative MOORE has offered a substitute amendment which would do exactly that, and I hope my colleagues will support that amendment, like I do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill as offered and to instead support Representative MOORE's substitute amendment.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, there are plenty of instances where training time and readiness training has counted towards the GI Bill. We talk about the basic training that reservists and Guard unit members go through. That has counted toward the GI Bill. And if there is a worry about the Federalization, Federal dollars already pay for the training days that we are seeking for the Guard unit members and the reservists to get credit for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MRVAN),

my good friend, member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology and Modernization.

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to rise in support of H.R. 1836, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act. I am so grateful for the sacrifices and the services of all our National Guard and Reserve members. They stand ready at a moment's notice to protect our Nation, our democracy, and the health of our communities.

Two instances jump out at me when I think of the heroism of the Indiana National Guard members from this past year. The first was being able to spend time with our brave National Guard members last year in the cafeteria of the Department of Labor on the other side of the Capitol complex when they bravely rushed to our Nation's Capitol to defend our Constitution and to protect our democracy.

The second was when I was able to stand side by side with them in the city of Gary when they operated a Federal COVID-19 vaccine site, which provided over 60,000 vaccines in Northwest Indiana at a critical time during our pandemic.

The First District is also home to the proud Slovak community. And I am particularly appreciative that the Indiana National Guard has a flourishing military partnership with our strong ally, the country of Slovakia. We also have the 113th Engineering National Guard, which I have shared time with, who the men and women have sacrificed their time, dedication, and efforts to go over to Afghanistan. What this bill does is it gives us the opportunity to have equitable training and equitable educational opportunity for our National Guardsmen.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation today has the opportunity to treat their Active Duty service on par with all branches of the military and ensure that every day the National Guard Reserve member serves our Nation in uniform is a day that counts toward their GI Bill benefits.

Thank you to the leadership of Congressman MIKE LEVIN, Chairman TAKANO, and all of my fellow members of the Committee on Veteran Affairs for your commitment to our Guard and Reserve members and for bringing this measure to the floor today.

I also thank Chairman TAKANO on his leadership to protect the National Guardsmen on the burn pits and the toxic fumes that we have passed and how we are providing benefits and making sure that that is distributed fairly and equitably and making sure they receive the benefits necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), a man who has truly experienced what it is to serve, the highest ranking officer that serves in this body today.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BOST for yielding me the time. I

am always proud to stand on this floor and talk about the men and women who serve our country. And it is our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition today to H.R. 1836, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021. And it kind of saddens me that I have to rise in opposition because while this bill, well-intentioned, is unfortunately potentially prone to unintended consequences on the overall readiness of our Armed Forces, Active Reserve and Guard. But first I must note that these issues could have been brought to light earlier had this piece of legislation gone through regular order, received proper consideration across all the normal things that we historically have done. It received no legislative hearings, foregoing the opportunity to receive input from key stakeholders, veteran service organizations, new committee members on both sides of the aisle, and even the Biden administration.

Without that engagement, we are just left with a bill that in its current form, which would count guard and reservists Federal Active-Duty service days towards GI eligibility, including for training. And there is a very subtle difference. In fact, it is a very exact difference in law between Active Duty for training and Active Duty.

I spent much of my 40-year Marine Corps career in the Reserve component. And in fact, a little known part of my bio, my first 2 years off of Active Duty in the Marine Corps, I spent 2 years as a member of the Rhode Island National Guard. So not only Active component, Reserve component, but also a guardsman as well.

And my final assignment for 4½ years, I had the blessing and the opportunity to command the Marine Corps Reserve, roughly 100,000 folks in 183 sites across the country at a time when we are deploying them at never-before-seen rates.

I will always stand by the unwavering service and sacrifice given by the men and women in the Reserve component and the National Guard.

□ 1315

This bill, however, may unintentionally become an obstacle to the recruitment and retention efforts of our Active component military. We are in a time, and have been for over 40 years, of an all-recruited force on all levels.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, even as Governors offer non-GI Bill education benefits to their Guard, the parity with Active-Duty Forces that this bill is seeking for the Guard and Reserves, again, could impact our Active-Duty military, which we need to be ready at all times, considering today's global threats.

Today, more than 4 years after my colleagues and I passed into law an un-

precedented GI Bill expansion to allow any veteran to use these GI Bill benefits without restriction of time, so they are good to go for as long as they live, I still believe there are many ways we can work responsibly to expand these benefits.

For these reasons, I will be voting in favor of my friend and colleague Mr. MOORE's benefit expansion amendment to ensure guard and reservists accrue GI Bill eligibility during any and all Federal Active-Duty days that are not training days.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill and support the Moore amendment.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a member of the committee who also serves as the chair of our Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies in Appropriations.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1836, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act. I thank Chairman TAKANO and Representative LEVIN for their important work on this legislation that finally acknowledges the undervalued service of our guard and reservists. The sponsors' sentiments ring true: Every day in uniform counts. At least it should count. It should count more.

In Ohio, there are over 11,400 National Guard members performing strategic and operational duties to whom we owe enormous gratitude.

Our National Guard protects our homeland and supports the mission of our troops abroad. It provides critical support to people in times of urgent need, from natural disasters to the public health COVID emergency we are in right now.

The National Guard and Reserves have been an invaluable readiness resource throughout the COVID-19 pandemic and are continuing to fill critical roles in response to the pandemic.

In my home State of Ohio, the Ohio National Guard has helped Ohio food banks distribute over 56 million pounds of food at 14 food banks and warehouses, including the Toledo Northwestern Ohio Food Bank. They have provided food banks the support they needed to keep children, seniors, veterans, and families fed during these very trying times.

They set up COVID-19 testing clinics and traveled the State to keep our communities safe. They are currently stationed at 12 testing locations across Ohio.

Thanks to President Biden's executive actions, 2,300 Guard members have been activated across Ohio to help hospitals and public health experts care for those most in need so all the omicron variant patients that are flooding

our hospitals have some hope of survival.

The service and dedication of our National Guard and Reserves require that we appropriately recognize and appreciate their sacrifices. While the debt we owe them cannot be fully repaid, the legislation before us ensures that these honorable men and women will receive the proper access to the educational benefits they so rightly deserve.

Providing these important GI Bill benefits will undoubtedly aid the recruitment and retention of National Guard units at home and abroad while further investing in our servicemembers' futures.

With six National Guard sites in my own congressional district and several Reserve units nearby, I know that this legislation will have a deep and lasting impact on our State's residents and those who answer the call to serve.

It is certainly my privilege to represent these guard and reservists in Congress, and I am proud to support enhancing the benefits that they can have access to and deserve for their service. May God be with all our men and women in uniform.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just to clear up some statements that I think were made by some of the people while talking, it was brought up that we actually have already dealt with toxic exposures, and we haven't. It is vitally important to understand that.

Those costs that we are still going to be looking at, whether it is 300 or 150 or whatever it is, we haven't found that out or figured that out yet. It is vitally important to understand that it is still out there, and there is going to be a cost.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), someone from our side of the aisle who does a great job and that we trust tremendously to watch our costs and watch our spending.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, before we vote on new legislation, it is very important that we have an honest look at the price tag. As Republican leader of the House Budget Committee, it is my responsibility to track how new spending impacts our Nation's bottom line.

Every time Washington passes unpaid-for legislation that adds a new benefit or program, or expands an existing one, our fiscal problems get much worse. At each one of these moments, we take another step toward either raising taxes on middle- and low-income working-class Americans or asking China for another IOU.

Look no further than the \$2 trillion Biden bailout bill that was passed back in March. It added trillions to our Nation's debt.

Also, the \$5 trillion BBB that was passed out of this House would add tril-

lions to our debt. According to the Congressional Budget Office, which is the official scorekeeper for Congress, the true cost of the bill before us is hidden. The true cost before us is hidden. Why?

On paper, the bill appears paid for. However, the new spending does not begin until 2025, and then the expansion of benefits does not go into effect until after the budget window in 2032. Meanwhile, the pay-fors all go away within the 10-year window. This is a creative way for Democrats to use budget gimmicks and delay program start dates to push through billions in unpaid-for spending.

These types of budget gimmicks are exactly what Democrats have been doing with the \$5 trillion spending bill that was called out and why Senators on the other side of the building will not support the legislation.

Congress must stop kidding itself with fanciful accounting. Stop pretending that creating and expanding government programs, especially mandatory spending programs, won't come with a real fiscal impact. Start being honest with the American people about the true price tag and the consequences of their reckless actions.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, there has been an honest reckoning and an honest assessment by the CBO, and this bill is paid for according to the rules, the same rules that my Republican counterparts observe.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), a member of the Financial Services Committee, where he is chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. I rise today in support of this legislation because the Guard and Reserve deserve parity. They have been there for us, and we must be there for them.

When natural disasters beset the land and there are wildfires on the West Coast, they are there. When hurricanes ravage the Gulf Coast, they are there. When tornadic activities are within all the midsection of the country, they are there. They have been there for us, and we must be there for them.

They do leave their families, just as the Active-Duty servicepersons do. Yes, they leave their children. They leave their wives. They leave newborns. They come to severe and protect us, just as they did after the assault on the Capitol.

They were here to prevent democracy from being eroded. They were here to protect the President and the Vice President. They have been here for us, and we must be there for them.

They have been there when many of us had no other hope other than to have them show up to defend us.

I remember Katrina. I remember what was happening in New Orleans. I went down there. I saw the National Guard come in. I saw them protect and defend.

We have a duty and an obligation to them, and this is our opportunity to fulfill it.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for what you are doing today for a multiplicity of reasons, one being that I don't want to see what happened to the Merchant Marine happen to the National Guard and the Reserve. It took them 44 years to get GI benefits. We cannot allow this to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I am there, I am here, and I will be there for them.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate with many others, and so many times it is being misunderstood that the Guard and Reserve don't receive these benefits when they are called up on Federal—they actually do on many of the Federal orders. The Moore amendment would allow that to occur.

I think many of our Members are confused on what they actually are receiving time for toward their GI Bill. I want to express again what we are saying is that the overreach here that occurs is that one weekend a month, 2 weeks a year, they know when they sign up that that is the difference. It is not going to be credited.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOWMAN), my good friend who serves on the Education and Labor Committee with myself and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to ensure that our veterans have the resources they need to access care after serving.

Every year, brave men and women enlist in the military, seeking to serve their country, pursue a better life, and obtain benefits and security for their future. This means being able to afford college and having access to housing, healthcare, and other opportunities.

Our troops are deployed into active war zones that too often leave veterans with PTSD, suicidal ideation, anxiety, addiction, depression, and other mental health challenges.

Regardless of what congressional district you live in, you will always take what happens in your service back home with you.

□ 1330

But when they return, our government has failed to provide them with the care and support they deserve.

The outcome is a veterans suicide crisis. The suicide rate for veterans is 1.5 times higher than the rate of non-veteran adults, and I see this in my district. I have had veterans call my office as a last resort after not being able to access the healthcare they need at the VA. My constituent services team has had multiple cases of veterans struggling with suicidal ideation and other mental health challenges who have expressed an immense frustration that no



one in our government seems to care about their well-being. Our veterans deserve better, and we must do better.

I am grateful for incredible organizations in my district like Black Veterans for Social Justice, Veterans for Peace, and The American Legion who are leading with care, working to support our veterans' mental health by destigmatizing mental health care and connecting veterans to mental health professionals. They regularly host support groups for veterans with mental health challenges, advocate for a stronger VA system, and provide one-on-one opportunities for veterans to learn about benefits available to them.

Our amendment to H.R. 1836 builds upon their work to ensure that when transitioning to civilian life, veterans receive information about what healthcare and mental healthcare services are available to them, including how to access the Veterans Crisis Line and seek mental health support. This amendment also specifies that this information should be provided to veterans in a manner that helps destigmatize mental health and encourages veterans to reach out.

These are important steps toward creating a society in which every single veteran has access to universal, high-quality healthcare and is empowered to seek out the mental health support they need to thrive.

If you are a veteran who is struggling with mental health challenges, please know that you are not alone and that seeking out mental health support is an important step toward feeling better. During these especially difficult times, we must care for ourselves and for one another.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, it is my esteemed honor and privilege to yield 1 minute to a champion and staunch advocate who is unparalleled in her support for our Nation's 22 million veterans. This Congress with her support we have continued to preserve the sacred trust of our men and women in uniform and the 200,000 servicemembers who become veterans each year.

Mr. Speaker, of course, I am referring to the Speaker of this great House from the great State of California, my own State.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor and for yielding.

We owe our veterans everything. They make us the home of the brave and the land of the free. They protect our democracy. They and their families make us so very, very proud.

I thank the gentleman again, Mr. TAKANO, as chair of the committee, and Mr. LEVIN for his leadership on this particular legislation which I will acknowledge in a moment.

First, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, nearly eight decades ago when Con-

gress enacted the first GI Bill, our Nation made a bipartisan and unbreakable promise: that every hero who steps forward to defend our Nation deserves the tools to succeed when they come home. Today, the House will proudly take another strong step toward fulfilling that pledge.

On behalf of the Congress, I commend the outstanding leadership of the committee chair, MARK TAKANO, who has ensured that the Veterans' Affairs Committee remains committed to its long legacy of bipartisanship. I salute the chair of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, Congressman MIKE LEVIN of California, both for leading on this important legislation every step of the way and for his lifetime advocacy on behalf of our military communities.

Every time our Nation seeks to strengthen and expand benefits for veterans, we have listened closely to our men and women in uniform and our veterans, taking their insight and expertise into account. We continue to listen to them today as we continue to build upon our progress and appropriately honor their service.

On a regular basis we have a meeting with our veterans service organizations. The American Legion is very much a part of that, as well as other groups reflecting our involvement in other wars since World War II, and we still have a few veterans from then.

What is interesting about this legislation today to me is that, again, it sprang from listening to our men and women in uniform and our veterans as to what their needs are. That is exactly how the first GI Bill came to be.

The veterans of World War I, recognizing the disadvantages that they were at after World War I, came forth with the proposal to have the GI Bill. So this was passed and signed by Franklin Roosevelt during World War II at the suggestion of veterans of World War I.

During the dark days of the Second World War and after listening to the calls of the brave veterans of World War I, President Roosevelt made clear the urgent moral imperative of supporting our returning soldiers.

In a message to Congress in November 1943, he said,

"The members of the Armed Forces have been compelled to make greater economic sacrifice and every other kind of sacrifice than the rest of us, and they are entitled to definite action to help take care of their special problems."

I am very proud that my father, Thomas D'Alesandro, was in this Chamber. He was a Member of Congress from Baltimore when the President said that. His brother would be lost shortly thereafter in the battle leading up to the Battle of the Bulge.

Less than a year later, Congress enacted the first GI Bill on an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote marking a turning point in how our Nation cares for our veterans. In doing so, we made

a transformational investment in our servicemembers, opening the doors to a college education and home ownership, launching millions of families into the middle class.

In 2008 it was my great privilege to serve as Speaker as the Congress took a crucial step to bring these benefits into the 21st century. With the Post-9/11 GI Bill—passed on a strong bipartisan vote and signed into law by President George W. Bush—we expanded the promise of a full, 4-year college education to veterans in Iraq and Afghanistan, and we ensured subsequent legislation that their families could also take advantage of that benefit. In 2017 we strengthened this law by improving benefits and closing gaps in eligibility so that we can best serve those who served our Nation.

Yet, today, too many veterans still do not receive equal access to the life-changing benefits they have earned. Over the last few decades, our valiant reservists and guardsmen have become even more integral to America's national security strategy. Our reservists often serve side by side with Active-Duty servicemembers, do the same jobs, and incur the same risks. And as our Nation has battled the pandemic, our communities have relied on our guardsmen to help protect our Nation from the deadly virus.

These heroes are essential to keeping our families and our Nation safe, but current law falls short of delivering the benefits they deserve. With the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act, we will ensure that every day our reservists and guardsmen heroes serve in uniform count toward their GI benefits. In doing so, we will lift up hundreds of thousands of current and future veterans across the Nation so that they, too, will have the opportunities they need to thrive in the 21st century economy.

Let me be clear: ensuring every servicemember has equal access to hard-earned benefits is an issue of fairness. When the House passes this legislation today, we will build on the proud, bipartisan progress forged by generations of lawmakers in this Chamber and in the Senate as well, we show our heroes that they will always have our unwavering support, and we honor the sacrifice on the battlefield. The military vows that on the battlefield we will leave no soldier behind, and when they come home, we pledge that we will leave no veteran behind.

There is so much more that we can learn from listening to our veterans and our servicemembers that we must do, so that they can take their strongest position when they come home.

Mr. Speaker, in this all-American spirit, I urge a very strong "aye" vote for this legislation.

I want to thank the distinguished chairman for his leadership and MIKE LEVIN for his relentless persistence for the benefit of our veterans as a member of that important committee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I think Members of the House need to understand because many speakers, including the previous speaker, brought up the fact that those who serve should receive these benefits who actually serve on the battlefield. When they do, they do. Under this existing system right now they receive that benefit.

What we are talking about now is an expansion to those days of reservist, the weekend a month and the 2 weeks a year. It is completely different from the fact when they are on Federal orders, and the Moore amendment would actually deal with that and take care of that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here today to offer this MTR.

If we adopt the motion to recommit, we will instruct the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to consider an amendment to H.R. 1836 which ensures members of the Armed Forces granted a general discharge under honorable conditions solely for refusing the COVID-19 vaccine are eligible for the GI Bill education benefits of which the Speaker just spoke about.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore ask unanimous consent to include the text of the amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, on August 24, 2021, the Secretary of Defense issued a directive requiring mandatory COVID-19 vaccination for all servicemembers, including those in the Ready Reserve and the National Guard. Despite the challenges this vaccine mandate currently faces in the Supreme Court, the Defense Department has proceeded to discharge those who refuse the vaccine.

Hundreds of soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and guardians have already been discharged, and as many as 20,000 servicemembers remain at risk over being involuntarily removed from service. It is outrageous.

To prevent those who have refused the vaccine from being dishonorably discharged, Congress included a provision in the fiscal year 2022 National Defense Authorization Act limiting discharges for failure to receive the COVID-19 vaccine to either an honorable discharge or a general discharge under honorable conditions.

This change succeeded in stopping further disciplinary action or court-martial for those who refuse the vaccine, however it potentially leaves many veterans in limbo between leaving the service with full benefits or having their education benefits stripped as they walk out the door.

As many of my veteran colleagues in this Chamber know, those servicemembers who receive a general discharge under honorable conditions are ineligible for the Montgomery and Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits due to restrictions Congress implemented in 2011.

While this change was intended to open eligibility status to members of the National Guard, there will now be a group of veterans who have served honorably up until the point of refusing COVID-19 vaccine who will now have their education benefits completely wiped out.

For those who may not know the full breadth of education benefits entitled to a veteran, let me give you just a couple of items. A veteran who was served at least 36 months on Active Duty is entitled to 100 percent of Post-9/11 GI benefits. That includes full tuition coverage for public schools, or roughly \$26,000 annually for private education or apprenticeships.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That veteran also receives a monthly housing allowance which varies by location, plus \$1,000 annually to cover books and other school supplies. Add that up, and we are talking about well over \$100,000 worth of education benefits a veteran loses simply by having their discharge characterized as general under honorable.

□ 1345

And let's be clear on who this is truly affecting, Mr. Speaker. We are not talking about recruits who are fresh out of basic training or those discharged at the MEPS station. These are men and women who have done their time, who have paid their dues, and who have served with distinction up until the point of refusing this vaccine.

And now we are going to tell them that we don't care how spotless their record may have been beforehand because they made a moral, ethical and even religious objection to a vaccine?

Those who have fought to defend our country should not be deprived of the benefits they so rightly deserve simply for refusing to comply with this divisive, and potentially unlawful, vaccine mandate.

My motion to recommit corrects this disparity by ensuring any member of the armed services who receives a general discharge under honorable conditions solely for the refusal of the COVID-19 vaccine is entitled to education benefits.

We are a country that rewards our heroes, not punishes them, and this motion to recommit makes sure of that. I urge the adoption of this motion to recommit.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The issue of how servicemembers are disciplined for refusing to take the vac-

cine has already been addressed in the National Defense Authorization Act. It already states plainly that there could be a general discharge, or an other-than-honorable discharge, or an honorable discharge. So there is, it seems to me, an irrelevance or it is unnecessary, this proposed MTR. So we already have a solution that has been agreed to in the Armed Services space and jurisdiction.

That being said, I do not have any further speakers, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am ready to close, but there are a few things in the closing that I want to be sure and bring up.

First off, the GI Bill cannot be included in—was not included, and those benefits would be removed if they refuse to take the vaccine. So the MTR is actually a legitimate motion that is something that we do need to deal with that was not taken care of in that bill.

And just so you know, a vitally important issue that was brought up by General Bergman, our speakers that we have had here today, they don't take this lightly. They are very serious about this. They have served themselves. They have served in these capacities. They understand the concern. And the concern of retention in the Active Forces is a serious concern.

We just received notice that the Army raised its max bonus for new recruits to \$50,000 due to struggling in trying to get people to come on to Active Reserve. By offering this benefit above and beyond that has been a concern of many of those that have expressed that concern.

But let me tell you this on this debate today. I want to thank Chairman TAKANO and others for a thoughtful and respectful debate, which is vitally important on an issue like this.

I also want to thank Congressman LEVIN. His passion on these issues was truly present as well, and we understand that.

You know, I am a former marine. I am a former active marine. I am a marine because, you know, once you are a marine you are always a marine. That is vitally important to remember. And as a father of a marine and a grandfather of a marine, these issues are personal to me.

Now, I understand the sacrifices that members of our National Guard make every day. And I think some of the things that were spoken of here today confuse the fact that when they get called up to Active Duty, go over to Iraq, go to Afghanistan, those qualify towards their GI bill. It does. And I am not opposed to them receiving education benefits, nor was anybody that spoke here today.

But the Guard and Reserve is that; it is a Guard and Reserve. And whenever they are activated, yes, they should receive those benefits. That is why the Moore amendment is so vitally important that we are going to be talking on



later as well. If we adopt that, it will cover everything except that component that those Guard and Reserve members knew when they joined, that they didn't get those benefits for that 1 weekend a month and those 2 weeks a year.

And why is that? Because it is a separate standing than an Active-Duty military personnel.

This discussion—and I know we all want to respect our Guard and Reserve, but this is not the way to do it. Doing it in the right order, hearing from everyone in committee, discussing these issues, bringing them up, and getting input from those stakeholders that are involved, was the proper way to do this; not to do it here on the floor in this manner.

I think the debate has been really good. I hope that the people that are listening understand. I hope that our colleagues understand what it is; that a vote against this is not a vote against the Guard and Reserve. A vote against this is simply saying, no, there is another way that is more fiscally responsible, that will still offer benefits and reward those for their service. But this is not the right way.

I encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on the underlying bill, “yes” on the amendments that we are coming up with, but “no” on the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will, in closing, say that the minority has not raised a substantive argument, a serious argument against the substance of this bill. This is a good, good piece of legislation, one that is agreed to and supported by numerous veterans service organizations.

To the issue of and to the objection raised by the minority over a lack of process and a lack of regular order, this is simply not true. We have had ample opportunity for the minority to have input in numerous hearings related to this topic.

And as to the concern over recruitment and retention of our Active-Duty Forces, I will remind my esteemed ranking member, or the esteemed ranking member, for whom I have great admiration for his own service and the service of his family in the military, that we turned to the Guard and Reserve in greater and greater dependence in the post-9/11 era. And because we were able to turn to them, we did not have to have discussions about a draft.

We had issues recruiting folks for our military in the early aughts to the numbers that we needed, and we had to turn to the Reserve and the Guard. So we need good incentives and great retention incentives for our Guard units and our Reserve units all across this country because we aren't going to depend on them less. In fact, we are going to depend on them more.

And the tempo of the training, all we are saying is that the readiness train-

ing they undergo is no less than the readiness training of our Active-Duty troops. Regardless of whether they knew or didn't know at the beginning when they signed up as reservists or guardsmen, they deserve to have every day count.

Now is the time for Congress and this House to say that every day of readiness training should count toward GI bill eligibility.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the bipartisan amendment that I have put forward, along with my colleagues DEBORAH ROSS, JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, and JAMAAL BOWMAN.

As my colleagues from both sides of the aisle have made clear, our Nation owes a tremendous debt to our veterans.

I am pleased that this week, the House will take up a bill to help improve access to services and benefits that our men and women in uniform have earned.

H.R. 1836—the National Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021—would allow Members of the National Guard and Reserves to count time spend in training towards their Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits.

I am so proud of the men and women in Wisconsin's National Guard who have mobilized throughout our nation's history in support of overseas combat operations in places like Iraq, Afghanistan, during both world wars, the Spanish-American War, and the Civil War and are now engaged in their longest ever domestic mobilization, to combat COVID-19.

They are a key part of our communities and to efforts to protect and defend our nation.

Our amendment to this bill simply attempts to help ensure that the VA take every opportunity to ensure that new veterans who are leaving or about to transition from active duty are aware of the VA benefits they may be eligible for, including critical health care services.

Unfortunately, too many vets leave the military without knowing what they are eligible for at the VA or do not have the documentation they need to prove their eligibility. As a result, they can find themselves missing out on critical benefits and services they need or trying to navigate bureaucratic red tape, without success, to try and find the right answers. These men and women answered the call to serve their country and it is our responsibility to honor the debt our Nation owes them for their service.

We can do better. And that must start with providing as much information as early as possible to those who could be eligible for VA benefits or services.

Our amendment requires the VA to inform new veterans of the medical care and services for which they are eligible, including community care; mental healthcare, care relating to military sexual trauma; and any other information the Secretary deems appropriate.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 1836, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act, which will expand eligibility for post-9/11 G.I. Bill educational benefits to members of the National Guard and the Reserves.

Current law defines the term “active duty” as those individuals who are on full-time duty

in the active military service of the United States, including full-time training duty, annual training duty, and attendance, while in the active military service, at a school designated as a service school by law or by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

H.R. 1836, will expand eligibility criteria to include those training in full-time National Guard duty, which includes the National Guard, the Army National Guard, and the Air National Guard, as well as those same members when performing active duty.

Under current rules, service members need three years on active-duty to be eligible for full Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits, which include 36 months of in-state college tuition, a monthly living stipend and other payouts.

Reaching that amount of time mobilized to active-duty is difficult for guardsmen and reservists, and outdated and confusing eligibility requirements means the difference of tens of thousands of dollars for college for those individuals.

For example, the deployment of thousands of Guard troops to Capitol Hill following the January 6 attack counted towards GI Bill eligibility, because the mission was being paid for with federal funds.

However, troops mobilized for crowd control during racial equality protests in Washington, D.C., last summer were not able to count that time, because those missions weren't funded by federal dollars.

Some other riot response missions across the nation were funded by federal funds, and did count towards the education benefits.

Similarly, tens of thousands of Guard and Reserve troops have been mobilized for pandemic response missions over the last two years, but their eligibility varies depending on the specific orders and units involved.

For years, members of the National Guard and Reserve Components have been disadvantaged and overlooked in the accumulation of their education benefits while performing the same or similar service as their Active-Duty counterparts.

Time and time again, through natural disasters, global pandemics, and threats to our democracy, our National Guard and Reserve members have answered the call to serve.

But despite taking on the same risks and doing the same jobs as their active-duty counterparts, these service members don't have access to the same benefits.

This has become much clearer and more severe during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Members of the National Guard and Reserve Component have risked their lives on the front lines of this pandemic, administering aid and protecting the Capitol on training status.

Our brave men and women continue to selflessly answer our nation's call and are long overdue the benefits befitting their service.

The Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021 will ensure the men and women of the National Guard are entitled to GI Bill education benefits when activated for service either for training or for operational needs of our country, just like their Active-Duty counterparts.

I want to thank all of our armed servicemen and women for their selfless dedication to our protection every day.

In my home state of Texas, the National Guard has been deployed time and time again to assist citizens and save lives during numerous natural disasters, including the Winter

Freeze of last February and the tragic Hurricane Harvey.

The Texas National Guard is host to nearly 21,000 troops, including its army and air components.

The National Guard is a diverse force that includes all ethnicities:

White: 69 percent;  
Black: 15 percent;  
Hispanic: 10 percent;  
Asian: 3 percent;  
Male: 83.1 percent;  
Female: 16.9 percent

This bill, in which we further the benefits and recognition that our servicemen and women deserve, also reminds us that we have an overriding duty to protect the health and dignity of those serving today.

For this reason, I would like to discuss the crisis that our National Guardsmen and Guardswomen have been thrust into at the Texas Governor's direction on our Southern Border.

In March 2021, the Texas Governor launched the ill-fated and ineffective Operation Lone Star which he claimed was necessary to stem a so-called invasion of migrants at Texas' southern border.

As of November 2021, more than 10,000 Texas National Guardsmen have been deployed to the southern border in pursuit of this folly.

According to published media accounts, National Guard members who have been activated for Operation Lone Star are experiencing habitual pay delays and poor working conditions during the border mission, including being exposed to COVID-19, and many are missing the equipment necessary for safety and mission success.

In addition, the National Guard has faced austere conditions and limited resources, leading to unsanitary conditions such as the lack of portable restrooms.

Rather than addressing these conditions, just last week the Texas Governor filed a frivolous lawsuit in federal court challenging the authority of President Biden, the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces to require that members of the National Guard be vaccinated against COVID-19.

There is no merit to this nuisance law suit as demonstrated by the summary rejection of similar arguments raised by neighboring Oklahoma Governor Stitt.

The Texas Governor's failure to comply with the policies intended to reduce the spread of COVID-19 among the Armed Forces will mean that there will be less military personnel available national disasters that have struck Texas in recent years, such as the winter freeze of last year.

This will also mean that there are fewer personnel to respond to any attacks on the homeland.

Encouraged by the Texas Governor's obstinacy, about 40 percent of the members of the Texas Army National Guard are refusing to get vaccinated, which puts at risk their colleagues and the persons they are sworn to defend and protect.

National Guardsmen and Guardswomen deployed in this disastrous mission at the Texas Governor's insistence face the deadly spread of COVID-19, unsanitary conditions, lack of pay, and a lack of a certain future.

These uniformed men and women deserve better, and some of them, seeing no alter-

native to their present reality, have decided to end it all.

Five National guard soldiers have shot and killed themselves in the past three months, and one more survived a suicide attempt.

One of these men, private first class Joshua R. Cortez, was preparing to accept a "lifetime job" with one of the nation's biggest health insurance companies in late October last year, but the Texas National Guard had other ideas.

Operation Lone Star required involuntary activations to meet the Texas Governor's troop quotas, and Cortez was one of the soldiers tapped to go on state active duty orders—with no idea how long the mission would last.

In November, the 21-year-old mechanic requested a hardship release from the mission: "I've been waiting for this job and I'm on my way to getting hired . . . I missed my first opportunity in September when I had to go on the flood mission in Louisiana. . . . I can not miss this opportunity because it is my last opportunity for this lifetime job."

Cortez's company commander recommended approval. But his battalion commander and brigade commander disapproved.

Within 36 hours of his request being denied, Cortez drove to a parking lot in northwest San Antonio and shot himself in the head.

Three other soldiers tied to Operation Lone Star have died by suicide, including:

Sgt. Jose L. De Hoyos was found dead in Laredo, Texas, on Oct. 26. He was a member of the 949th Brigade Support Battalion's headquarters company.

1st Sgt. John "Kenny" Crutcher died Nov. 12, as time ran out on his temporary hardship waiver. He was the top NCO for B Company, 3rd Battalion, 144th Infantry.

1st Lt. Charles Williams, a platoon leader in Crutcher's company, died at home overnight Dec. 17 while on pass.

The string of suicides raises urgent questions about the mission's conditions and purpose, as well as the way it's organized and manned through indefinite involuntary call-ups.

This is an excellent and common-sense bill that will enhance the benefits of our servicemen and women.

We must also act to ensure that our servicemen and women are protected from COVID-19, both for their own safety and the safety of our nation.

When called to action, the National Guard performs the name duties as our active duty forces, oftentimes in extraordinarily difficult situations.

Although we cannot bring back the lives lost due to the Texas Governor's misguided actions, we can remember the names of those we have lost and work to ensure that we treat all members of our military equally and with dignity and respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part A of House Report 117-225 shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. ROSS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 117-225.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following new section:

**SEC. 4. PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO VETERANS DURING TRANSITION TO CIVILIAN LIFE.**

(a) REQUIREMENT.—In providing information to new veterans regarding benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary shall ensure that the information includes the following:

(1) A description of the medical care and services for which the veteran will be eligible under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, including with respect to—

(A) community care under section 1703 of such title;

(B) mental health care, including how to access the Veterans Crisis Line established under section 1720F(h) of such title; and

(C) care relating to military sexual trauma (as defined in section 1166 of such title).

(2) Any other information that the Secretary determines appropriate, including information about the services and benefits to which the veteran may be entitled.

(b) MANNER.—The Secretary shall provide the information under subsection (a) in a manner that promotes the destigmatization of mental health care and encourages veterans to reach out for support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 860, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Ross) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support for my bipartisan amendment, which will require the VA to notify transitioning servicemembers of the services for which they are personally eligible.

Notification must include information about mental healthcare, community care under the MISSION Act, and care related to military sexual trauma.

Troubling reports have found that many transitioning veterans are not aware of the health benefits available to them through the VA. A recent Department of Defense Office of the Inspector General report found that the DOD has failed to provide proper mental health screening and care for transitioning veterans; in part, because so many veterans do not understand what care is available to them.

The transition away from active service can be a tumultuous time during which many new veterans face mental health issues. Left unaddressed, these issues can be debilitating and deadly.

My father served as a psychiatrist in the Air Force during the Vietnam era. He witnessed firsthand the need for proper and timely mental healthcare among veterans. But mental health resources at the VA can only be helpful to those who know of their existence.

We owe a debt of gratitude to our veterans, and they deserve gold-standard and seamless access to the benefits that they have earned.

My amendment will help new veterans understand and access the care to which they are entitled.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Congressman BOWMAN, and Congresswoman MOORE for joining me in offering this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman ROSS' amendment would require VA to share information regarding mental healthcare, community care, and other services to veterans who have recently transitioned out of the military.

Leaving the military can be a difficult and vulnerable time for many veterans. It is critical that separating servicemembers receive support as they restart their civilian lives. Part of that is ensuring that they are educated and empowered to take advantage of the benefits they earned by serving the Nation in uniform.

Now, right now, the education occurs primarily through the Transition Assistance Program, or TAP. TAP was created in 1990, and always includes information on the VA care, benefits and services that those transitioning out of the military may be eligible for.

Now, TAP is a great program, and it is vitally important because those of us who are older veterans, the only tap we got was on the shoulder and a hey, good to see you; have a great life. But now TAP actually has that opportunity.

In addition, the Trump administration began the Solid Start program in 2019. Through Solid Start, all new veterans are contacted by the VA three times during their first year out of uniform. Those contacts occur 90, 180, and 360 days after separation from service and are a priceless opportunity for newly separated servicemembers to connect with the VA.

□ 1400

Congresswoman ROSS' amendment would require that the VA provide information to those new veterans, including information regarding the healthcare, including mental health, community care, military sexual trauma, and the Veterans Crisis Line.

As I indicated, the VA already provides new veterans with information during TAP and through the Solid Start program. This amendment simply ensures that the materials VA provides to new veterans specifically includes these subjects.

For that reason, I am in support of her amendment, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support that. I thank

Congresswoman ROSS and the cosponsors of this amendment for their work, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the chairman of Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Ross, González-Colón, Moore, and Bowman amendment, and I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, there is no way better way to connect veterans with medical care and services than first making sure that they are aware of the care that they have earned with their service.

The Ross amendment makes sure that VA informs our veterans of this care they have earned just as they are entering civilian life.

The first months are crucial in a veteran's transition out of the military, and the Ross amendment ensures that veterans are aware of what kind of care and support they can access and how they can access it.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Ross amendment.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, this amendment will help new veterans understand the specific benefits that they have and that they have earned through their service. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment, the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HOULAHAN). Pursuant to House Resolution 860, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS).

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MOORE OF ALABAMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 117-225.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD WHO PERFORM CERTAIN FULL-TIME DUTY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3301(1)(C)(ii) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(not including training)” after “title 32”; and

(2) by striking “for the purpose of responding to a national emergency declared by the President and supported by Federal funds”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2022.

#### SEC. 2. ADJUSTMENTS OF IRRRL RATE.

Subparagraph (E) of the loan fee table under section 3729(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(E)(i) Interest rate reduction refinancing loan (closed on or after July 1, 2022, and before August 8, 2022) .....	0.85	0.85	NA
(ii) Interest rate reduction refinancing loan (closed during a period not covered by clause (i)) .....	0.50	0.50	NA”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 860, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment to replace the underlying bill with the text of my bill, H.R. 2047.

This amendment would provide additional eligibility for members of the National Guard who are called up on Federal Active-Duty orders for service other than for training.

As a former member of the National Guard, I know all too well the challenges that they face. The National Guard has transitioned in recent years from a reserve force for domestic missions to a full-time force operating around the globe.

My amendment would remove the Presidential declaration requirement that has restricted benefits for so many members of the National Guard in the past. It would make it so that members of the National Guard would receive eligibility for the time spent under any Federal Active-Duty orders that are not for training.

This would provide eligibility for Federal benefits to those who support COVID-19 relief, respond to natural disasters, and protect our southern border.

I agree with Chairman LEVIN that we must take a hard look at duty status reform and the expansion of benefits afforded to the National Guard and the Reserve component while operating under Federal Active-Duty orders.

My amendment would make it clear that if you are called up on Federal orders for something other than training, you should receive eligibility for GI Bill benefits.

However, I am concerned that the expansion proposed in his bill is a little too broad. We should allow the DOD to complete their efforts to better align benefits to certain duty statuses before we move forward with such a broad expansion. I think General Bergman hit on that point today, that we need to give them time to work through the process.

An expansion of every day in uniform could cost over \$2 billion over the next

10 years in mandatory benefits, where my expansion is only \$16 million.

We talked about inflation in the hearing today. We have seen the highest increase in 40 years. I think we need to try to get a handle on this kind of runaway spending. I think my approach is more surgical, if you will. It allows the benefits to our Guard and servicemembers without just painting a broad brush for everyone in uniform.

My amendment ensures that members of the National Guard that are called to action receive access to educational programs, like all other veterans, while doing so in a fiscally responsible manner.

Finally, I would like to thank Ranking Member BOST and all his staff for their support on this amendment.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I would like to take a moment to highlight for the sponsor of this amendment, Representative MOORE, and all Members, just how severely this amendment would harm National Guard and reservists from their States and districts.

Congressman MOORE represents the great State of Alabama. Despite being the 24th most populous State in the Union, Alabama has the 12th largest National Guard in the Nation by number of servicemembers. Among the units in the Alabama National Guard that the Moore amendment would shortchange by eliminating training days—and I say training days are also readiness days—is the Alabama 20th Special Forces Group.

Members from this group, and units like it, must complete roughly 2 full years of training, from basic training to completion of the arduous and highly competitive Special Forces Qualification Course, just to be qualified as Special Forces Green Berets.

In order to maintain a high level of readiness and be ready to deploy when our Nation calls on them, these servicemembers must constantly attend additional training to maintain certifications and proficiencies critical to their jobs as reservists.

To be clear, this training is conducted at Active-Duty schools right alongside their Active-Duty counterparts, yet guard and reservists don't receive the same credit for the days they are in uniform, despite maintaining the exact same readiness requirements.

Readiness matters. Consider this: In 2013, reservists spent 87,000 days on title 32 orders, which is how the Reserve Force assists with floods, hurricanes, and other significant events. However, in 2021, that number had grown to 9.5 million days.

This amendment would continue to uphold this unequal policy and prevent

members of the Alabama 20th Group from accruing days of service for training. Training is another word for readiness.

Some States and servicemembers from units like Alabama's 20th Group carry a heavier burden, but this example is not unique to Alabama. All across the country, Guard and Reserve members from every State put their civilian lives on hold in defense of our Nation. They give much of themselves, their sweat, blood, and sometimes even the ultimate sacrifice in service. Whether during training or deployment, they deserve the same benefits for their days in service. They have earned it.

Finally, I would also note that the Moore amendment uses the same IRRRL rate change found in H.R. 1836, which we agree is a fair update to the IRRRL program.

Let's be clear: A vote for this amendment is a direct statement to our Guard and Reserve servicemembers that you don't think their days in service are equal to those of their Active Duty counterparts.

Representative MOORE served in the National Guard, and I thank and commend him for that service. Now, I know that he is a humble man, like most of our servicemembers, but I think his days in service should be honored and given their due credit. I know he may have participated in ROTC, but if his education wasn't fully paid for by that program, then I think he should be given credit for his National Guard service for GI Bill eligibility.

Madam Speaker, I urge Representative MOORE to reconsider his submission of this amendment, and I urge all Members to oppose the Moore amendment.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST), the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of Congressman MOORE's amendment to H.R. 1836, as amended, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021.

While I do not support the underlying text of the bill, I believe that Congressman MOORE's amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, would make important, commonsense changes to it.

The underlying bill would make a vast and costly expansion of benefits to Guard and Reserve members to include GI Bill eligibility for every day in uniform under Federal orders. This includes GI Bill eligibility for weekend drills and training.

As I stated during the general debate earlier, I believe that this bill's \$2 billion mandatory cost is using rare offsets that take away from the priorities this committee has in serving our Nation's veterans. That is why today I stand in support of Congressman MOORE's amendment.

These substituted provisions would simplify current law so that any time spent on Federal Active Duty by members of the Guard and Reserve for service other than for training would count toward GI Bill eligibility. This would include service in support of protecting the southern border, federally funded missions in support of efforts to combat COVID-19, and other critical Active Duty missions.

The amendment would only require \$16 million in mandatory offsets, compared to the \$2 billion the underlying bill would cost.

Not only is this policy change good for our Nation's veterans, but it also does not burden our children, grandchildren, and future generations of American taxpayers with tens of billions of dollars over several decades in unfunded offset costs like the underlying bill would.

This is without question a more measurable and fiscally responsible approach to more fully honor the valuable service that these men and women of the Guard and Reserve perform.

I want to thank Congressman MOORE for his hard work on the amendment. Before yielding back, I would like to say that if a person votes against this bill, it is not a vote against the Guard and Reserve. It is a vote for the taxpayers, which Guard and Reserves are also taxpayers. It is the reason why we should have had a more full debate on this bill in committee so these things could have been brought up.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, let me just say there is nothing commonsense about this amendment. Injustice to our reservists and our Guard units is not common sense. Unfairness to our guard and reservists is not common sense.

To say that this is a fiscal burden to our Nation, who depends on our guard and reservists in natural disasters and who our Nation will rely on even more in the future, that is not common sense.

Madam Speaker, it is time to make every day of readiness training that our reservists and our Guard unit members perform count toward their GI Bill eligibility.

The GI Bill, as Speaker PELOSI has said, did amazing things for this Nation in the post-World War II era. That same amazing contribution of our reservists and our guardsmen will continue.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 860, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appear to have it.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 198, nays 225, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]  
YEAS—198

Aderholt	Gibbs	Miller (WV)
Allen	Jimenez	Miller-Meeks
Armstrong	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Arrington	Gonzales, Tony	Mooney
Babin	Gonzalez (OH)	Moore (AL)
Bacon	Good (VA)	Moore (UT)
Baird	Gooden (TX)	Mullin
Balderson	Gosar	Murphy (NC)
Banks	Granger	Nehls
Barr	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Bentz	Graves (MO)	Norman
Bergman	Green (TN)	Obernolte
Bice (OK)	Greene (GA)	Owens
Biggs	Griffith	Palazzo
Bilirakis	Grothman	Pence
Bishop (NC)	Guest	Perry
Boebert	Guthrie	Pfluger
Bost	Hagedorn	Posey
Brady	Harris	Reed
Brooks	Harshbarger	Reschenthaler
Buchanan	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Buck	Hern	Rodgers (WA)
Bucshon	Herrell	Rogers (KY)
Budd	Herrera Beutler	Rose
Burchett	Hice (GA)	Rosendale
Burgess	Hill	Rouzer
Calvert	Hinson	Rutherford
Cammack	Hollingsworth	Salazar
Carey	Hudson	Scalise
Carl	Huizenga	Schweikert
Carter (GA)	Issa	Scott, Austin
Carter (TX)	Jackson	Sessions
Cawthorn	Jacobs (NY)	Simpson
Chabot	Johnson (LA)	Smith (MO)
Cloud	Johnson (OH)	Smith (NE)
Clyde	Johnson (SD)	Smucker
Cole	Jordan	Spartz
Comer	Joyce (OH)	Staubert
Crawford	Joyce (PA)	Steel
Crenshaw	Katko	Stefanik
Curtis	Keller	Steil
Davidson	Kelly (MS)	Steube
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Stewart
DesJarlais	Kim (CA)	Taylor
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff	Tenney
Donalds	LaHood	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	LaMalfa	Tiffany
Dunn	Lamborn	Timmons
Ellzey	Latta	Turner
Emmer	LaTurner	Upton
Estes	Lesko	Valadao
Fallon	Letlow	Van Drew
Feenstra	Long	Van Dyne
Ferguson	Loudermilk	Wagner
Fischbach	Lucas	Walberg
Fitzgerald	Luetkemeyer	Walorski
Fitzpatrick	Mace	Waltz
Fleischmann	Malliotakis	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Mann	Wenstrup
Fox	Mast	Westerman
Franklin, C.	McCarthy	Wilson (SC)
Scott	McCaul	Wittman
Fulcher	McClain	Womack
Gaetz	McHenry	Young
Gallagher	McKinley	Zeldin
Garbarino	Meuser	
Garcia (CA)	Miller (IL)	

NAYS—225

Adams	Beatty	Bowman
Aguilar	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Allred	Beyer	F.
Amodel	Bishop (GA)	Brown (MD)
Auchincloss	Blumenauer	Brown (OH)
Axne	Blunt Rochester	Brownley
Barragán	Bonamici	Bush
Bass	Bourdeaux	Bustos

Butterfield	Jeffries	Peters
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Phillips
Cárdenas	Johnson (TX)	Pingree
Carson	Jones	Pocan
Carter (LA)	Kahele	Porter
Case	Kaptur	Pressley
Casten	Keating	Price (NC)
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Raskin
Chu	Kildee	Rice (NY)
Cicilline	Kilmer	Ross
Clark (MA)	Kim (NJ)	Roy
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Cleaver	Kinzinger	Ruiz
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Rush
Connolly	Kuster	Ryan
Cooper	Lamb	Sánchez
Correa	Langevin	Sarbanes
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Scanlon
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Craig	Lawrence	Schiff
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Schneider
Crow	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Cuellar	Lee (NV)	Schrier
Davids (KS)	Leger Fernandez	Scott (VA)
Davis, Danny K.	Levin (CA)	Scott, David
Dean	Levin (MI)	Sewell
DeFazio	Lieu	Sherman
DeGette	Lofgren	Sherrill
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Sires
DelBene	Luria	Slotkin
Delgado	Lynch	Smith (NJ)
Demings	Malinowski	Smith (WA)
DeSaulnier	Maloney	Soto
Deutsch	Carolyn B.	Spanberger
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Doggett	Manning	Stansbury
Doyle, Michael	Massie	Stanton
F.	Matsui	Stevens
Escobar	McBath	Strickland
Eshoo	McCollum	Suozi
Espeailat	McEchin	Swalwell
Evans	McGovern	Takano
Fletcher	McNerney	Thompson (CA)
Foster	Meeks	Thompson (MS)
Frankel, Lois	Meijer	Titus
Gallego	Meng	Tlaib
Garamendi	Mfume	Tonko
Garcia (IL)	Moore (WI)	Torres (CA)
Garcia (TX)	Morelle	Torres (NY)
Golden	Moulton	Trahan
Gomez	Mrvan	Trone
Gonzalez,	Murphy (FL)	Underwood
Vicente	Nadler	Vargas
Gottheimer	Napolitano	Veasey
Green, Al (TX)	Neal	Vela
Grijalva	Neguse	Velázquez
Harder (CA)	Newman	Wasserman
Hayes	Norcross	Schultz
Higgins (NY)	O'Halleran	Waters
Himes	Ocasio-Cortez	Watson Coleman
Horsford	Omar	Welch
Houlahan	Pallone	Wexton
Hoyer	Panetta	Wild
Huffman	Pappas	Williams (GA)
Jackson Lee	Pascrell	Wilson (FL)
Jacobs (CA)	Payne	Yarmuth
Jayapal	Perlmutter	

NOT VOTING—9

Cartwright	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Cheney	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Cline	Palmer	Williams (TX)

□ 1451

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Messrs. BEYER, CORREA, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, SCHIFF, CONNOLLY, and ROY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. FEENSTRA, CAWTHORN, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. FITZPATRICK changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Ross)	Bass (Cicilline)	Bonamici
Auchincloss	Bera (Kilmer)	(Kuster)
(Clark (MA))	Blumenauer	Boyle, Brendan
Barragán (Beyer)	(Beyer)	F. (Swalwell)

Brooks (Moore	Hudson	Ocasio-Cortez
(AL))	(McHenry)	(Bowman)
Brownley	Jacobs (NY)	Panetta (Kildee)
(Kuster)	(Garbarino)	Payne (Pallone)
Bush (Bowman)	Jayapal (Raskin)	Pingree
Butterfield	Johnson (TX)	(Cicilline)
(Kildee)	(Jeffries)	Pocan (Raskin)
Cárdenas (Soto)	Kahele (Case)	Porter (Wexton)
Casten	Katko (Meijer)	Pressley (Garcia
(Underwood)	Kim (CA) (Steel)	(IL))
Chu (Clark (MA))	Kim (NJ)	Price (NC)
Cohen (Beyer)	(Pallone)	(Connolly)
Cooper (Clark	Kind (Connolly)	Reschenthaler
(MA))	Kinzinger	(Armstrong)
Crawford	(Meijer)	Roybal-Allard
(Stewart)	Kirkpatrick	(Correa)
Crist (Soto)	(Pallone)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Cuellar (Jackson	Lamborn	Ruppersberger
Lee)	(McHenry)	(Trone)
DeFazio (Brown	Langevin	Rush (Kaptur)
(MD))	(Lynch)	Salazar
DeGette (Blunt	Lawson (FL)	(Gimenez)
Rochester)	(Soto)	Schrier
DeSaulnier	Lee (CA)	(Spanberger)
(Beyer)	(Khanna)	Sires (Pallone)
Doggett (Raskin)	Leger Fernandez	Smucker (Joyce
Doyle, Michael	(Clark (MA))	(PA))
F. (Connolly)	Lieu (Beyer)	Speier (Escobar)
Evans (Mfume)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Stansbury
Frankel, Lois	Lowenthal	(Jacobs (CA))
(Clark (MA))	(Beyer)	Stanton (Levin
Gaetz (Boebert)	Mace (Timmons)	(CA))
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Suozi (Raskin)
(Sherman)	Patrick	Titus (Connolly)
Gohmert (Weber	(Jeffries)	Tlaib (Khanna)
(TX))	Matsui	Torres (NY)
Gonzalez,	(Thompson	(Cicilline)
Vicente)	(CA))	Vela (Correa)
McCaul (Ellzey)	McEachin	Waltz (Mast)
(Correa)	(Wexton)	Waters (Takano)
Grijalva (Garcia	Meng (Kuster)	Watson Coleman
(IL))	Moore (WI)	(Pallone)
Grothman	(Beyer)	Welch
(Fitzgerald)	Moulton (Beyer)	(McGovern)
Hagedorn (Carl)	Nadler (Pallone)	Wilson (FL)
Herrera Beutler	Napolitano	(Cicilline)
(Moore (UT))	(Correa)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. Fitzgerald of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1836 to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The material previously referred to by Mr. FITZGERALD is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 4. CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR A MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES GRANTED A GENERAL DISCHARGE UNDER HONORABLE CONDITIONS ON THE SOLE BASIS THAT SUCH MEMBER FAILED TO OBEY A LAWFUL ORDER TO RECEIVE A VACCINE FOR COVID-19.**

(a) ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 3011(a)(3)(B) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “an honorable discharge;” and inserting an em dash; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new clauses:

“(i) an honorable discharge; or

“(ii) a general discharge under honorable conditions on the sole basis that the individual failed to obey a lawful order to receive a vaccine for COVID-19;”.

(b) POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 3311(c) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) A general discharge under honorable conditions on the sole basis that the individual failed to obey a lawful order to receive a vaccine for COVID-19.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 204, nays 219, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—204

Aderholt	Gallagher	McCarthy
Allen	Garbarino	McCaul
Amodei	Garcia (CA)	McClain
Armstrong	Gibbs	McHenry
Arrington	Jimenez	McKinley
Babin	Gohmert	Meijer
Bacon	Gonzales, Tony	Meuser
Baird	Gonzalez (OH)	Miller (IL)
Balderson	Good (VA)	Miller (WV)
Banks	Gooden (TX)	Miller-Meeks
Barr	Gosar	Moolenaar
Bentz	Granger	Mooney
Bergman	Graves (LA)	Moore (AL)
Bice (OK)	Graves (MO)	Moore (UT)
Biggs	Green (TN)	Mullin
Bilirakis	Greene (GA)	Murphy (NC)
Bishop (NC)	Griffith	Nehls
Boebert	Grothman	Newhouse
Bost	Guest	Norman
Brady	Guthrie	Obernolte
Brooks	Hagedorn	Owens
Buchanan	Harris	Palazzo
Buck	Harshbarger	Pence
Bucshon	Hartzler	Perry
Budd	Hern	Pfleger
Burchett	Herrell	Posey
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Calvert	Hice (GA)	Reschenthaler
Cammack	Hill	Rice (SC)
Carey	Hinson	Rodgers (WA)
Carl	Hollingsworth	Rogers (KY)
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Rose
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Rosendale
Cawthorn	Issa	Rouzer
Chabot	Jackson	Roy
Cloud	Jacobs (NY)	Rutherford
Clyde	Johnson (LA)	Salazar
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Comer	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Crawford	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Crenshaw	Joyce (OH)	Sessions
Curtis	Joyce (PA)	Simpson
Davidson	Katko	Smith (MO)
Davis, Rodney	Keller	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Donalds	Kim (CA)	Spartz
Duncan	Kinzing	Stauber
Dunn	Kustoff	Steel
Ellzey	LaHood	Stefanik
Emmer	LaMalfa	Steil
Estes	Lamborn	Steube
Fallon	Latta	Stewart
Feenstra	LaTurner	Taylor
Ferguson	Lesko	Tenney
Fischbach	Letlow	Thompson (PA)
Fitzgerald	Long	Tiffany
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Timmons
Fleischmann	Lucas	Turner
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer	Upton
Fox	Mace	Valadao
Franklin, C.	Malliotakis	Van Drew
Scott	Mann	Van Dyne
Fulcher	Massie	Wagner
Gaetz	Mast	Walberg

Walorski  
Waltz  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup

Westerman  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack

NAYS—219

Adams	Gomez
Agullar	Gonzalez,
Allred	Vicente
Auchincloss	Gotthelmer
Axne	Green, Al (TX)
Barragan	Grijalva
Bass	Harder (CA)
Beatty	Hayes
Bera	Higgins (NY)
Beyer	Himes
Bishop (GA)	Horsford
Blumenauer	Houlahan
Blunt Rochester	Hoyer
Bonamici	Huffman
Bourdeaux	Jackson Lee
Bowman	Jacobs (CA)
Boyle, Brendan	Jayapal
F.	Jeffries
Brown (MD)	Johnson (GA)
Brown (OH)	Johnson (TX)
Brownley	Jones
Bush	Kahele
Bustos	Kaptur
Butterfield	Keating
Carbajal	Kelly (IL)
Cárdenas	Khan
Carson	Kildee
Carter (LA)	Kilmer
Case	Kim (NJ)
Casten	Kind
Castor (FL)	Kirkpatrick
Castro (TX)	Krishnamoorthi
Chu	Kuster
Cicilline	Lamb
Clark (MA)	Langevin
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)
Cleaver	Larson (CT)
Clyburn	Lawrence
Cohen	Lawson (FL)
Connolly	Lee (CA)
Cooper	Lee (NV)
Correa	Leger Fernandez
Costa	Levin (CA)
Courtney	Levin (MI)
Craig	Lieu
Crist	Lofgren
Crow	Lowenthal
Cuellar	Luria
Davids (KS)	Lynch
Davis, Danny K.	Malinowski
Dean	Maloney,
DeFazio	Carolyne B.
DeGette	Maloney, Sean
DeLauro	Manning
DelBene	Matsui
Delgado	McBath
Demings	McCollum
DeSaulnier	McEachin
Deutch	McGovern
Dingell	McNerney
Doggett	Meeks
Doyle, Michael	Meng
F.	Mfume
Escobar	Moore (WI)
Eshoo	Morelle
Esper	Moulton
Evans	M Ryan
Fletcher	Murphy (FL)
Foster	Nadler
Frankel, Lois	Napolitano
Gallego	Neal
Garamendi	Neguse
Garcia (IL)	Newman
Garcia (TX)	Norcross
Golden	O'Halleran

Cartwright	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Cheney	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Cline	Palmer	Williams (TX)

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1518

Mr. O'HALLERAN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CAWTHORN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Ross)	Grijalva (García)	Nadler (Pallone)
Auchincloss	(IL)	Napolitano
(Clark (MA))	Grothman	(Correa)
Barragan (Beyer)	(Fitzgerald)	Ocasio-Cortez
Bass (Cicilline)	Hagedorn (Carl)	(Bowman)
Bera (Kilmer)	Herrera Beutler	Panetta (Kildee)
Blumenauer	(Moore (UT))	Payne (Pallone)
(Beyer)	Hudson	Pingree
Bonamici	(McHenry)	(Cicilline)
(Kuster)	Jacobs (NY)	Pocan (Raskin)
Boyle, Brendan	(Garbarino)	Porter (Wexton)
F. (Swalwell)	Jayapal (Raskin)	Pressley (Garcia
Brooks (Moore	Johnson (TX)	(IL))
(AL))	(Jeffries)	Price (NC)
Brownley	Kahele (Case)	(Connolly)
(Kuster)	Katko (Meijer)	Reschenthaler
Bush (Bowman)	Kim (CA) (Steel)	(Armstrong)
Butterfield	Kim (NJ)	Roybal-Allard
(Kildee)	(Pallone)	(Correa)
Cárdenas (Soto)	Kind (Connolly)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Casten	Kinzing	Ruppersberger
(Underwood)	(Meijer)	(Trone)
Chu (Clark (MA))	Kirkpatrick	Rush (Kaptur)
Cohen (Beyer)	(Pallone)	Salazar
Cooper (Clark	Lamborn	(Gimenez)
(MA))	(McHenry)	Schrier
Crawford	Langevin	(Spanberger)
(Stewart)	(Lynch)	Sires (Pallone)
Crist (Soto)	Lawson (FL)	Smucker (Joyce
Cuellar (Jackson	(Soto)	(PA))
Lee)	Lee (CA)	Speier (Escobar)
DeFazio (Brown	(Khanna)	Stansbury
(MD))	Leger Fernandez	(Jacobs (CA))
DelBene (Kilmer)	(Clark (MA))	Stanton (Levin
DeGette (Blunt	Lieu (Beyer)	(CA))
Rochester)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Suozi (Raskin)
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Titus (Connolly)
(Beyer)	(Beyer)	Tlaib (Khanna)
Doggett (Raskin)	Mace (Timmons)	Torres (NY)
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	(Cicilline)
F. (Connolly)	Patrick	Vela (Correa)
Evans (Mfume)	(Jeffries)	Waltz (Mast)
Frankel, Lois	Matsui	Waters (Takano)
(Clark (MA))	(Thompson	Watson Coleman
Gaetz (Boebert)	(CA))	(Pallone)
Garamendi	McCaul (Ellzey)	Welch
(Sherman)	McEachin	(McGovern)
Gohmert (Weber	(Wexton)	Wilson (FL)
(TX))	Meng (Kuster)	(Cicilline)
Gonzalez,	Moore (WI)	
Vicente	(Beyer)	
(Correa)	Moulton (Beyer)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 287, nays 135, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—287

Adams	Brownley	Cole
Aguilar	Bucshon	Connolly
Allred	Burgess	Cooper
Amodei	Bush	Correa
Auchincloss	Bustos	Costa
Axne	Butterfield	Courtney
Bacon	Cammack	Craig
Barragan	Carbajal	Crist
Bass	Cárdenas	Crow
Beatty	Carey	Cuellar
Bera	Carl	Curtis
Beyer	Carson	Davids (KS)
Bice (OK)	Carter (LA)	Davis, Danny K.
Bilirakis	Case	Dean
Bishop (GA)	Casten	DeFazio
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Blunt Rochester	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Bonamici	Chu	DelBene
Bourdeaux	Cicilline	Delgado
Bowman	Clark (MA)	Demings
Boyle, Brendan	Clarke (NY)	DeSaulnier
F.	Cleaver	DesJarlais
Brown (MD)	Clyburn	Deutch
Brown (OH)	Cohen	Diaz-Balart



Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Dunn  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Evans  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fletcher  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Frankel, Lois  
Gaetz  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garbarino  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Gimenez  
Gohmert  
Golden  
Gomez  
Gonzalez, Vicente  
Gotthelmer  
Green, Al (TX)  
Griffith  
Grijalva  
Guest  
Harder (CA)  
Hartzler  
Hayes  
Herrell  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huffman  
Huizenga  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs (CA)  
Jacobs (NY)  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson (TX)  
Jones  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Kahele  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (MS)  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (CA)  
Kim (NJ)  
Kind  
Kinzinger  
Kirkpatrick  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Lamb

Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lieu  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lucas  
Luria  
Lynch  
Malinowski  
Malliotakis  
Maloney  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meijer  
Meng  
Meuser  
Mfume  
Moolenaar  
Moore (UT)  
Moore (WI)  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Newhouse  
Newman  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
Oberholte  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascarella  
Payne  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Reed  
Rice (NY)  
Rogers (KY)

Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Rutherford  
Ryan  
Salazar  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Spartz  
Speier  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Staubert  
Steel  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Suozi  
Swalwell  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Wagner  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Yarmuth  
Zeldin

Issa  
Jackson  
Johnson (LA)  
Jordan  
Keller  
Kelly (PA)  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Luetkemeyer  
Mace  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul

McClain  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (WV)  
Miller-Meeks  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)  
Mullin  
Murphy (NC)  
Nehls  
Norman  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Sessions

Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner  
Van Drew  
Van Duyne  
Walberg  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Womack  
Young

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHIFF). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2130

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) at 9 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

## NOT VOTING—10

Buck  
Cartwright  
Cheney  
Cline

Higgins (LA)  
McClintock  
Palmer  
Rogers (AL)

Webster (FL)  
Williams (TX)

□ 1620

Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mrs. WAGNER, and Messrs. JOHNSON of South Dakota and SMUCKER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Ross)  
Auchincloss  
(Clark (MA))  
Barragan (Beyer)  
Bass (Cicilline)  
Bera (Kilmer)  
Blumenauer  
(Beyer)  
Bonamici  
(Kuster)  
Boyle, Brendan  
F. (Swalwell)  
Brooks (Moore  
(AL))  
Brownley  
(Kuster)  
Bush (Bowman)  
Butterfield  
(Kildee)  
Cárdenas (Soto)  
Casten  
(Underwood)  
Chu (Clark (MA))  
Cohen (Beyer)  
Cooper (Clark  
(MA))  
Crawford  
(Stewart)  
Crist (Soto)  
Cuellar (Jackson  
Lee)  
DeFazio (Brown  
(MD))  
DeBene (Kilmer)  
DeGette (Blunt  
Rochester)  
DeSaulnier  
(Beyer)  
Doggett (Raskin)  
Doyle, Michael  
F. (Connolly)  
Evans (Mfume)  
Frankel, Lois  
(Clark (MA))  
Gaetz (Boebert)  
Garamendi  
(Sherman)  
Gohmert (Weber  
(TX))  
Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
(Correa)

Grijalva (Garcia  
(IL))  
Grothman  
(Fitzgerald)  
Hagedorn (Carl)  
Herrera Beutler  
(Moore (UT))  
Hudson  
(McHenry)  
Jacobs (NY)  
(Garbarino)  
Jayapal (Raskin)  
Johnson (TX)  
(Jeffries)  
Kahele (Case)  
Katko (Meijer)  
Kim (CA) (Steel)  
Kim (NJ)  
(Pallone)  
Kind (Connolly)  
Kinzinger  
(Meijer)  
Kirkpatrick  
(Pallone)  
Lamborn  
(McHenry)  
Langevin  
(Lynch)  
Lawson (FL)  
(Soto)  
Lee (CA)  
(Khanna)  
Leger Fernandez  
(Clark (MA))  
Lieu (Beyer)  
Lofgren (Jeffries)  
Lowenthal  
(Beyer)  
Mace (Timmons)  
Maloney, Sean  
Patrick  
(Jeffries)  
Matsui  
(Thompson  
(CA))  
McCaul (Ellzey)  
McEachin  
(Wexton)  
Meng (Kuster)  
Moore (WI)  
(Beyer)  
Moulton (Beyer)

Nadler (Pallone)  
Napolitano  
(Correa)  
Ocasio-Cortez  
(Bowman)  
Panetta (Kildee)  
Payne (Pallone)  
Pingree  
(Cicilline)  
Pocan (Raskin)  
Porter (Wexton)  
Pressley (Garcia  
(IL))  
Price (NC)  
(Connolly)  
Reschenthaler  
(Armstrong)  
Roybal-Allard  
(Correa)  
Ruiz (Aguilar)  
Ruppersberger  
(Trone)  
Rush (Kaptur)  
Salazar  
(Gimenez)  
Schrier  
(Spanberger)  
Sires (Pallone)  
Smucker (Joyce  
(PA))  
Speier (Escobar)  
Stansbury  
(Jacobs (CA))  
Stanton (Levin  
(CA))  
Suozi (Raskin)  
Titus (Connolly)  
Tlaib (Khanna)  
Torres (NY)  
(Cicilline)  
Vela (Correa)  
Waltz (Mast)  
Waters (Takano)  
Watson Coleman  
(Pallone)  
Welch  
(McGovern)  
Wilson (FL)  
(Cicilline)

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5746, NASA ENHANCED USE LEASING EXTENSION ACT OF 2021

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 117-226) on the resolution (H. Res. 868) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 5746) to amend title 51, United States Code, to extend the authority of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to enter into leases of non-excess property of the Administration, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5746, NASA ENHANCED USE LEASING EXTENSION ACT OF 2021

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 868 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 868

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5746) to amend title 51, United States Code, to extend the authority of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to enter into leases of non-excess property of the Administration, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on House Administration or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-28. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs.

## NAYS—135

Aderholt  
Allen  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks  
Buchanan  
Budd  
Burchett  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)

Cawthorn  
Chabot  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Comer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Donalds  
Duncan  
Ellzey  
Emmer  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Foxy  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Fulcher

Gallagher  
Garcia (CA)  
Gibbs  
Gonzales, Tony  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hern  
Hice (GA)  
Hill  
Hinson  
Hollingsworth